

## REMARKS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office action, the following remarks are submitted for Examiner's consideration.

Claims 1-6, 13, 14 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner points to the language "by them surface contact." The rejection is respectfully traversed since this language was cancelled in the preliminary amendment submitted with the application.

Claims 1-6, 13, 14 and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,207,065 to Lavin et al. (hereinafter "Lavin") in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,874,941 to Woolard et al. (hereinafter "Woolard"). For the following reasons the rejection is respectfully traversed.

With reference to claim 1, neither Lavin nor Woolard teaches a sorption unit having a sorption medium. As explained in the present application, a sorption medium is provided in a sorption unit to exothermically absorb a working medium in a cooling cycle (see, for example, page 2, lines 18-22).

Lavin discloses a method and apparatus for separating a gas mixture. The apparatus of Lavin includes a dephlegmator 8 which takes the form of an aluminum plate-fin brazed heat exchanger comprising a multiplicity of vertical passages 10 through which air is guided. The dephlegmator is used in order to provide a product either enriched in nitrogen or enriched in oxygen. The dephlegmator of Lavin does not include any medium for exothermically absorbing a working medium to serve as the sorption medium of claim 1.

Woolard discloses a heat exchanger, but like Lavin, does not disclose a sorption medium as required by claim 1. Therefore, even if Lavin were combined with Woolard, each of the required elements of claim 1 would not be disclosed or suggested. Thus, claim 1 and its rejected dependent claims 2-6, 13, 14 and 16 are patentable over the prior art of record.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Lavin in view of Woolard and in

further view of U.S. Patent No. 1,316,636 to Opitz (hereinafter "Opitz") or German Patent 39881 to Jacobi (hereinafter "Jacobi"). For the following reasons, the rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 depends, through intervening claims, from claim 1 and thus requires the sorption medium discussed above with regard to claim 1. For the reasons set forth above, neither Lavin nor Woolard discloses or suggests the sorption medium of claim 1. It is further submitted that neither Opitz nor Jacobi discloses a sorption unit having a sorption medium as claimed. Therefore, even if Lavin, Woolard, Opitz and Jacobi were combined, each of the required elements of claim 7 is not disclosed or suggested by the references. Thus, claim 7 is patentable over the prior art of record.


In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 30882US1.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By:

  
Aaron A. Fishman, Reg. No. 44682

526 Superior Avenue, East  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-1484  
(216) 579-1700

Date: January 14, 2002